

### ***RECORD OF INTERVIEW***

The undersigned representative of the applicant conducted an after-final interview with the Examiner on May 6, 2010. Applicant's representative demonstrated how the applicant's earlier arguments had satisfactorily explained the patentability of the invention over the cited references and how the applicant's earlier claim amendments sufficiently defined the patentable aspects of the invention over the cited references. In particular, applicant's representative discussed how Claim No. 1 as originally filed was not anticipated by the Skeen reference and how applicant's arguments in support of patentability was consistent with the limitations found in the claims. Similarly, applicant's representative discussed how the amendment to Claim No. 12 and the arguments in support of patentability thereon supported patentability over the prior art of record.

The Examiner acknowledged that the finality of the office action dated April 20, 2010 should be withdrawn because the elements recited in Claim No. 1 as originally filed and applicant's arguments as provided in response to the prior non-final office action had supported the patentability of Claim No. 1 over the cited references. However, the Examiner cautioned that in withdrawing the finality of the prior office action, he would have to perform another search which could result in new prior art that would cause him to enter another non-final office action in the case.